

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/624,496

Applicant(s)

LUETGERT ET AL.

Examiner

Jerry A. Lorengo

Art Unit

1734

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jerry A. Lorengo.

(3) _____.

(2) Mr. Schrot.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 31 August 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 37.

Identification of prior art discussed: EP 0816122A2 to Misumi et al..

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Applicant and the Examiner discussed proposed limitations to claim 37 which appear to differentiate the instant invention over the prior art to Misumi et al. Specifically, the applicant proposed defining both the decal sheets and the overlaying foil as comprising a transferable coating on a removable carrier sheet. The examiner also suggested further defining the invention to disclose that the overlaying foil is disposed over both the decal coated and uncoated sections of the wood composite. The Applicant agreed that this limitation might be acceptable upon client consent. The examiner also indicated that any claim amendments would be evaluated in light of a further search and consideration of the prior art. .